

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 16, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that by this response all bases of rejection and objection are traversed. Upon entry of this response, claims 4, 7-10, 15, 16 and 19 remain in the application. Claims 4, 7-9, 15 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-14, 17 and 18 have been canceled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Ibsen et al. (US 6,458,340). Claims 1-3, 6, 11 and 12 have been canceled.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradford et al. (US 5,582,001). Claims 17 and 18 have been canceled.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegrist (US 3,964,880). Claim 5 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 depends from claim 7 and has been incorporated into claim 7, and claim 7 now includes all the limitations of claim 5, and therefore it is submitted that claim 7 is rewritten in a form that is allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5, 8-10, 15, 16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4, 8, 9, 15 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and are now allowable. Claims 10 and 16 are dependent from claims 9 and 15 respectively and are now dependent from allowable claims and are therefore allowable. The limitations of claim 5 have been incorporated into claim 7, which is now allowable, and claim 5 has then been canceled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In summary, claims 4, 7-10, 15, 16 and 19 remain in the application. Claims 4, 7-9, 15 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-14, 17 and 18 have been canceled. Remarks have been made pointing out the differences between the present invention and the prior art references traversing all of the Examiner's rejections and objections. Accordingly in view of the remarks, applicants assert that claims 4, 7-10, 15, 16 and 19 meet all statutory requirements and respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above identified application he is cordially invited to contact applicants' attorney at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

UOP LLC



Arthur E. Gooding
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 50,513
Phone: (847) 391-1520
Fax: (847) 391-2387

AEG/sgb